

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-11 are pending in the application, with Claims 1 and 5-9 being independent claims.

Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Uchida (U.S. Pat. No.6,161,026) in view of Cushman et al. (U.S. Pat. No.6,125,287).

Claims 5 and 11 are again rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Seidensticker, Jr. et al. (U.S. Pat. No.6,128,012).

Claim 10 is again rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seidensticker, Jr. et al.

It is gratefully acknowledged that Claims 6-9 remain allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 1 and 3-11 are amended as presented above, with Claims 6-9 being rewritten into independent form. No new subject matter is introduced.

Regarding the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the Examiner states that Uchida in view of Cushman et al. renders the claim obvious. Amended Claim 1 teaches, in part, a key input method for diversifying key functions in a mobile telecommunication terminal, the method comprising detecting whether a user has input a single scroll key, *the single scroll key for menu scrolling in left, right, upward and downward directions, the single scroll key being any one key* of a plurality of keys provided on the mobile telecommunication terminal.

Uchida discloses a key input method for diversifying key functions in a mobile telecommunication terminal, the method relying on a single specific switch 10 (FIG. 1, col. 3 lines 49-57). Uchida is silent about “*the single scroll key for menu scrolling in left, right, upward and downward directions, the single scroll key being any one key*” taught by Amended Claim 1.

Cushman et al. discloses a wireless telephone having an improved user interface, the telephone using an “OPTions” key for menu scrolling (FIG.1, col. 3 lines 10-27). Cushman et al. fails to disclose anywhere providing flexibility such as *the single scroll key for menu scrolling in left, right, upward and downward directions, the single scroll key being any one key* taught by Amended Claim 1. Cushman et al. indeed teaches away the flexibility in asserting the OPTions key as “dedicated OPTions key (just above the keypad)” (col. 3 line 11, FIG. 1).

Clearly, Amended Claim 1 structurally differs from Uchida, Cushman et al., or the combination thereof.

Regarding the rejection of Claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), the Examiner states that Seidensticker, Jr. et al. anticipates each and every element of the claim. Amended Claim 5 teaches, in part, a key input method for diversifying key functions in a mobile telecommunication terminal, the method comprising detecting whether a user has set a scroll function when displaying a menu screen; if so, detecting whether an input state of *a single scroll key* set for a scroll function is maintained for a predetermined period of time, *the single scroll key for menu scrolling in left, right, upward and downward directions, the single scroll key being any one key* of a plurality of keys provided on the mobile telecommunication terminal.

Seidensticker, Jr. et al. discloses a key input method for menu scrolling, the method relying on a keypad 36 comprising *four* single scroll keys 38, 40, 42 and 44 for scrolling directions (FIG. 1, col. 5 lines 7-17). Seidensticker, Jr. et al. fails to disclose flexibility such as *a single scroll key, the single scroll key for menu scrolling in left, right, upward and downward directions, the single scroll key being any one key* taught by Amended Claim 5.

Clearly, Amended Claim 5 structurally differs from Seidensticker, Jr. et al

Regarding Claim 6, the Examiner indicated that Claim 6 has allowable subject matter but is objected as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, Claim 5 (Office Action, pages 6-7). Claim 6 is rewritten in independent form as Amended Claim 6 including all of the

limitations of Claim 5, and so would be allowable.

Regarding Claim 7, the Examiner indicated that Claim 7 has allowable subject matter but is objected as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, Claim 5 (Office Action, pages 6-7). Claim 7 is rewritten in independent form as Amended Claim 7 including all of the limitations of Claim 5, and so would be allowable.

Regarding Claim 8, the Examiner indicated that Claim 8 has allowable subject matter but is objected as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, Claim 5 (Office Action, pages 6-8). Claim 8 is rewritten in independent form as Amended Claim 8 including all of the limitations of Claim 5, and so would be allowable.

Regarding Claim 9, the Examiner indicated that Claim 9 has allowable subject matter but is objected as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, Claim 5 (Office Action, pages 6 and 8-9). Claim 9 is rewritten in independent form as Amended Claim 9 including all of the limitations of Claim 5, and so would be allowable.

Accordingly, all of the claims pending in the Application, namely, Claims 1-11, are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicants' attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael J. Musella  
Reg. No. 39,310  
Attorney for Applicant

The Farrell Law Firm  
333 Earle Ovington Boulevard Suite 701  
Uniondale, New York 11553  
Tel 516-228-3565  
Fax 516-228-8475

MJM/DGL/mk